



•

•

1	:
1	1 .1
2	2 .1
2	3 .1
2	4 .1
2	5 .1
3	6 .1
3	7 .1
4	:
4	1 .2
9	2 .2
15	3 .2
18	4 .2
28	5 .2
28	1 .5 .2
30	1 .5 .2
33	6 .2

34			
34			
34			
34			
35			
37			
37			
37			
38			
38			
38			
39			
39			
48			
53			
54			

1 .3

2 .3

3 .3

4 .3

5 .3

6 .3

7 .3

8 .3

9 .3

10 .3

1 .4

2 .4

3 .4

35	1
35	2
36	3
36	4
39	5
44	6
45	7
46	8
47	9

Abstract

The social Effects of Drugs user, A field Study on Hayil Area In The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Habib AL- Rasheidi

Mu'tah University, 2009

This study mainly aimed to Know the effect of Drug using on the social aspects in the addicton in Hayil Area in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the extent of difference in this according to age, educational level, residency and income. To achieve the study gool, apurposeful sample of (150) subject who are drug user and prisoners in Hayil were selected.

The mathematical data were collected through a questionnaire, to aswer the study questions, the means and standard deviations, and three way (ANOVA) were used.

The study approached that the most important social effects resulted from using the drugs were the unemployment, women huarasement, and poverty, and that the addictor loses his ability to deal with the others. The addication makes societies unable to depend on their selves as well as disadaptation in the marital relations, weakining the human conscience. Moreover, the results showed that the most affected were the persons who had low educational level, older, the more income and the residents of Finally, study approached significant cities. the a group of recommendations.

.(2006)

2005

381

5991.363 2005 3 . 3655623 4862.151

320.904

(2005) 391834

.

3.1

: 4.1

. -1

-2

.1

($\alpha \le 0.05$) .2

($\alpha \le 0.05$) .3

: 6.1

(2005).

7.1

:

. .1 .

(2000)

:

.(2007) :

.

:

.(1999)

. (2002)
. (2006)
. (Psychological Dependence) . 1

.2

(2006).

: .3

(2002). :

.1 35

.1 .2

.3 .4

.5

(2002).

: .2 : .1 .2 : .3 .(2002

(2002).

.(2002)

2.2

: .1

.

: .2

: .3

· 4

(2005). (2005).

.1

.2

.3

. :

). (2002 (2002) . :

: .

· : .

·

.

(1998): . .1

.2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 .10 .11 .12 .13

(2003).

.1 .2 .3 .4

.5

```
(2006).
                                              .6
                                              .7
                                             .8
                                            .9
                                             .10
                                             .11
                                             .12
   .(1998
                                             .13
.( + )
                     ( )
                                 ( )
.(1995 ).
```

(2004).

.(2005

):

.(2005).
: : :

.(1998)

: 3.2

.(2006)

(2003).

.(1996) 1992 %97

.(2002).

%66) %82

. **(2002** 484

%67

543 . **(2003**)

. (2004)

.

.(2002)

.(2004).

. (1999)

4 .2

:

.(2004).

:

(2004).

:

.(149:2004:)

.

(

)

(2003

)

.(2000

.

.(149 2004:)

(2004).

.(88 2006:)

.(2004)

:

: .(2004) .(2004).
.(2004).

Ney " "

·

(David, 2000)

(2003 . (1999 Life Style Theory (230 2004 : .1 .2 .3

(231:2004).

.

(1999).

.(2002): (2004). (66:) (

25

(2004).

:

: :

(2006) .

()

(

(2002).

: :

: .1

)

.(

(2002).()

(2002).()

.5

1 .5 .2 (1998)

5 .2

(2001)

-12) (18

) .(2002

1998 (%40)

.(2002) (2000)

(2004)

300 .

(2005)

70

: 2 .5 .2

(Samuel & John ,2001)

(Leech.2000)

7.787.00

1999-1996

%26

%28 .1

%35 .2

(David, 2000).

Talbot Recovery campus

40 36 19

%15 %31

Benzodiazepines % 15

Millon (MMP2)

116

%55

% 33 %38 Narcissistic

(Witters & Witters ,1986)

43

%13 %29 %46

%90 %1 %4 %7 (Kathleen & Bruce,2005)

24

GUZ & CLoninger,1995)
(2005
(66)

(Rashda & Rathshanda, 2005)

50

Talbot recovery campus

(Johns, 2007)

65 % 34 27

6.2

1.3

. 150

3 .3

. 150

:

. 40 (1)

%20.7	31	20
%25.3	38	29 - 20
%24	36	39-30
%30	45	40
	150	

(2)

. (2)

 %35.3
 53

 %18
 27

 %18
 27

 %19.3
 29

 %9.3
 14

 150

:

4001

(3)

%20	30	2000
%23.3	35	3000-2001
%18•7	28	4000-3001
%38	57	4001
	150	

•

(4)

· (4)

%20	30	
%30	45	
%50	75	
	150	

4 .3 .1 .2 .3 .4 (SPSS) .5 5 .3 (2004 (2004 (Sammuel, 2001) (5-1) 6.3

37

%80

7 .3

.(0.89)

8 .3

. (0.05)

9 .3

(150)

1 .4

(5)

4	1.06582	4.46	(1
16	1.06134	4.12	(2
45	.85475	2.47	- (3
1	.85284	4.74	(4
38	.91314	3.28	(5

3	.94419	4.56	(6
43	1.00613	3.03	(7
35	.80382	3.35	(8
			(G
37	.83984	3.29	(9
			·
42	1.01893	3.09	(10
72	1.01075	3.09	(10
39	1.00622	3.26	(11
			(11
12	1.03671	4.18	(12
36	1.02313	3.34	(13
			`
33	1.05341	3.38	(14
24	1.26378	3.65	(15
31	.96750	3.48	(16
	1 20002	4.10	
11	1.29892	4.19	(17
2	.85245	4.68	/10
<i>_</i>	.03243	٦.00	(18

5	1.09710	4.38	(19
19	1.13171	4.03	(20
25	1.38059	3.60	(21
44	1.51031	2.91	(22
13	1.11576	4.17	(23
41	1.48955	3.12	(24
40	1.13153	3.18	(25
8	1.01761	4.22	(26
15	.97138	4.12	(27
14	1.08702	4.14	(28
10	1.08064	4.20	(29

20	1.04056	3.93	(30
23	1.34781	3.71	(31
46	1.47803	· 2.30	(32
22	1.26059	3.85	(33
9	1.23781	4.22	(34
18	1.08891	4.04	(35
6	.86140	4.36	(36
28	1.44551	3.53	(37
29	1.42719	3.50	(38
30	1.39383	3.48	(39
26	1.33787	3.57	(40

7	1.10025	4.25		(41
17	1.12725	4.06		(42
32	1.23477	3.45		(43
34	1.22686	3.35		(44
27	1.30742	3.57		(45
21	1.13910	3.86		(46
		3.74		(47
			(5)	

(5) 4.74 2.30

 $(\alpha \le 0.05)$

. (6)

(6)

.079 .512 2.335 .171 3 .045 2.453 .179 4 .716 3.469 .760 .020 .253 3 .507 .945 .069 12 .828 X .976 9 .290 .021 .190 X .233 1.300 .095 12 1.139 × × × .440 1.027 .075 19 1.425 6.353 .073 87 150 2112.986

(6) (2.335) (F) $(0,05 \ge \alpha)$ (David,2000) (Johns, 2007) F $.(0,05 \ge \alpha)$ (2.453) (8) (7) .047 .023 (3.79) (3.74) (3.60) (3.64)

(3.72)

()

(3.469) F
(0,05≥α)
(9)

(8)

4000	4000-3001	3000-2001	2000		
0.	00			(3.59)	200
				(3.67	7) 3000-2001
				(3.75	5) 4000-3001
				(3.79)	4000

 $(\alpha \le 0.05)$

(9)

(9)

.002 6.495 .563 2 1.126 .087 147 12.744 149 13.870

(.002) (6.495) ()

. (10)

(10)

3.81	3.74	3.74		
-	-		3.74	
.002			3.61	
		-	3.81	
		$(\alpha \le 0.05)$		*
		(10)		
			$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$	

•

: **2.4** :

(5)

(2001)

(18)

(2005) .

(6)

(1)

(2000)

(19)

(2004) . (36)

(2004)

(41)

(2002)

(2004)

(2003)

(32)

(33)

Kathleen)

(& Bruce,2005

(22)

(2004)

(1998 (34) (2004 (2005 (2005 (2005

)

(2004

:

2 .4

.1

.2

.3

.4

: -

(2004)

(15)

.(1998).

.(2004)

(2003)

.(2003)

(2002)

.(2002) .

.(2004) .

.236

.(2002)

(2004)

(2004) (2001) .(2004) .(2000) . .(1996) .(1997) .)1995 .(1984) (2005) (2004).

(2006)

(2006)

: (2002)

.(2000)

: (1998)

.(2002) .

: .(2005)

(2002) .

.(2000)

(2003).

(2004)

(2005)

(2005)

(2004).

.(2006) .

(2007)

.(1999) .

(2002)

(2006).

.1 (2005)

.(2006) .

(2004)

: -

- Bureau of justice statistics (2003). **intimate partner violence and age of candian centre for justic statistic** (2001) family violience in candia: astatical profile, Canada.
- David, m (2000). **Delinguency and drift inc** new yourk pp.28-29.
- Edward , K Hant Ziar (1988) . An ego , **Self Theory Of Substance Dependence** , U.S.D Of Health and service.
- Heally ,K,Smith ,and Sulivan (1988) . **Batterer intervention : Program Approaches and Criminal Justice Strategies** , series : Issue and Practis , National institute Of Justice
- Jones, B.(2007). Social problems issue opinions and solution mcgraw-hill;book company new york p19.
- Kathleen, B.and Bruce (2005). Resource for dropout from drug abuse treatment symptoms personality and motivation, addictive behaviors. Vol.31. issue.1.
- Leech, C (2002). American journal of public Health, international encyclopedia of justice studies
- Rashada, R.(2005). Locus of control and personality traits of made substance abusers and non abusers, journal of physiology, Vol2, No.1, p 41-44
- Richard, j.(1986). **Society personality and deviant behavior** study of tri-ethnic community holt reinehard and Winston inc.p.23-33.
- Samuel, B. J and John (2001). Addicted patients with personality disorder: traits, schemas and presentation problem. **Journal of personality disorder**, vol.15, issue.1. page 72-83.
- Tonque, E (1988) . **Treatment Options in Responding to drug Misuse Problem**, Bulletin on Narcotics, vol. 1 . issue (9).
- Witters, P.J.& witters W.(1981). **Drug & society " Abiologicl perspective**. Boston Jones & Bartlett Pulishers NC.

()

```
.()35 () 35-20 () 20 -1
-2
() -
() -
() -
-
-
-
-
-
() 2000 -
.() 3000 -2001 -
.4000 -3001 -
.() 4000 -
```

-4 .() -.() -

(×) .1 .2 - .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 .10

		•		•	
					.11
					111
					12
					.12
					.13
					.14
					.15
					.16
					.17
					.18
					.10
					10
					.19
					.20
			_		
					.21
<u> </u>	L	L	<u> </u>	ļ	

			.22
			.23
			.24
			.25
			.26
			.27
			.28
			.29
			.30
		:	.31

		1	ı		
32 33 33 34 34 35 35 36 37 38 38 39 39 39 39					
32 33 33 34 34 35 35 36 37 38 38 39 39 39 39					
32 33 33 34 34 35 35 36 37 38 38 39 39 39 39					
32 33 33 34 34 35 35 36 37 38 38 39 39 39 39					
33 33 34 34 35 35 35 36 37 37 38 38 39 39 39 39 39				•	22
.34 .35 .36 .37 .38 .39					.32
.34 .35 .36 .37 .38 .39					
35 36 37 38 39 40					.33
35 36 37 38 39 40					
.36 .37 .38 .39					.34
.36 .37 .38 .39					
.36 .37 .38 .39					.35
.37 .38 .39					
.37 .38 .39					26
.38					.30
.38					
.39					.37
.39					
.40					.38
.40					
.40					.39
					40
					.40
.41					
					.41
<u> </u>					

			.42
			.43
			_
			4.4
			.44
			.45
			1.6
			.46